Perturbative approach to the dynamics of a trapped ion interacting with a light field

V Penna and F A Raffa
Politecnico di Torino, Dipartimento di Scienza Applicata e Tecnologia,
Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, I-10129 Torino, Italy

We present a second-order perturbative analysis of the model describing a two-level trapped ion interacting with a traveling laser field, in the Lamb-Dicke regime. Unlike the customary approach, based on the interaction picture and the rotating wave approximation, we reduce the original Hamiltonian to a time-independent model, unitarily equivalent to a spin-boson model, which features a form well suited to apply the perturbation theory. We determine the first and second-order corrections of eigenstates and eigenvalues. By varying the interaction parameters we identify four regimes characterized by different eigenvalue distributions (possibly including level doublets) and suggest the presence of an intermediate regime where the spectrum undergoes macroscopic changes. In this regime, where the perturbation approach does not hold, our reduced Hamiltonian is shown to reproduce the Jaynes-Cummings model.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Pq, 42.50.Ct, 03.65.Fd

arXiv:1403.2321v1 [quant-ph] 10 Mar 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum systems formed by trapped ions interacting with a light field have been the subject of growing interest over the two last decades, both due to their manifold applications in fields such as quantum measurement, generation of nonclassical states, and quantum-information processing [1]-[3] and because they allow to engineer effective simulators of complex quantum phenomena [4]-[7]. The intense theoretical work on these systems and the parallel experimental progress in ion trapping are thoroughly reviewed in [1] and [8]-[10].

The distinctive feature of trapped-ion models is the time dependence introduced by the coupling with the light field. The resulting dynamics, which is known to be extremely complex but also very rich, has been explored by applying or combining different well-established analytic techniques and approximation schemes. The customary approach entails transforming the Hamiltonian of the system in the interaction picture and simplifying it through the rotating-wave approximation (RWA). Its study can be further simplified through the Lamb-Dicke (LD) approximation $\ell/\lambda_L << 1$ according to which the size ℓ of the ion-confinement region is much smaller than the laser wavelength λ_L. Applications of such an approach are well documented, e. g., in [11, 12], with reference to different ion-light resonance conditions, in the field of quantum computation [13, 14], and in the theoretical study of the atomic population inversion [15] and of the decoherence induced by measurement processes [16].

Non standard approach are reported as well. For instance, in [17] and [18], by resorting to appropriate unitary transformations, the exact diagonalization of the time-dependent Hamiltonian H_t describing the ion-light field interaction is obtained also beyond the LD approximation, while in [10] it is shown that a unitary transformation of this Hamiltonian leads to a mapping into the Jaynes-Cummings model, no need being to utilise the interaction picture and the RWA. For unrestricted values of the LD parameter this technique holds provided the physical parameters of the system (detuning, LD parameter, trap and Rabi frequencies) satisfy specific constraints. Interestingly, an analogous transformation scheme has been devised in the analysis of mesoscopic spin-boson systems of trapped ions in a phonon bath [19].

The reduction of Hamiltonian H_t to a unitarily-equivalent time-independent model discussed in [10] is also the path we follow in this work. We resort to appropriate unitary transformations in order to eliminate in the ion-light interaction term both the time dependence, controlled by the laser frequency ω_L, and the exponential factors depending on the trapped-ion position. The new Hamiltonian H_η represents a *minimal model*, not further reducible to a more elementary form, in which the dependence on laser wave number k_L (which is proportional to the LD parameter η) is simply *linear*. It is worth noting that this model can be proved to be equivalent (up to a unitary transformation) to the well-known single-mode spin-boson model which is thoroughly reviewed in [20] and whose integrability has been recently analyzed in [21].

The main aim of this paper consists in exploiting the linear character of H_η to diagonalize the latter, in the LD regime, *via* the standard perturbation method in which η assumes, quite naturally, the role of perturbation parameter. After determining the first-order corrections of the eigenstates of H_η, we show that first-order corrections in the eigenvalue perturbation series are zero and calculate the second-order corrections. We then focus on the resonant case where the laser detuning vanishes. Despite this assumption, the resulting eigenvalues feature a strong dependence on the interplay between the trapping-potential frequency, the interaction with the laser field and η. By varying such parameters, we identify four independent regimes corresponding to different spectrum structures in which the eigenvalue distribution can be more or less dense and possibly features level doublets. The eigenstates of H_η are shown to provide simple time-dependent solutions to the Schrödinger problem of the original trapped-ion Hamiltonian: their superposi-

tion supplies the general solution in which time evolution appears to be significantly influenced by the structure of the eigenvalue distribution.

We also prove that applying the RWA to our Hamiltonian leads straightforwardly to the Jaynes-Cummings model, and show that the RWA regime and the regimes where the perturbation approach can be applied are, in a sense, complementary in that they hold in adjacent but non overlapping regions of the parameter space.

The layout of the paper is the following. In section 2 we perform the reduction of the ion-light interaction model to its minimal form. Section 3 is devoted to the application of perturbation theory. The properties of the resulting spectrum are discussed in section 4 while section 5 is focused on the derivation of the Jaynes-Cummings model. Section 6 is devoted to concluding remarks.

II. MINIMAL FORM OF THE TRAPPED-ION MODEL

We consider an ion trapped in a one-dimensional harmonic potential which interacts with a single traveling light field. The internal structure of the ion is represented by a two-level system with ground and excited states $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$, respectively, whose energy difference is $\hbar\omega_0 = \hbar(\omega_e - \omega_g)$. The relevant free Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{\rm f} = \hbar\nu\hat{n} + \hbar\omega_0 S_z \,,$$

where ν is the harmonic-potential frequency, $\hat{n} = a^\dagger a$ is the number operator and boson operators a, $a^\dagger$ obey commutator $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$. Operator $S_z = (|e\rangle\langle e| - |g\rangle\langle g|)/2$ describes the two-level system together with raising and lowering operators $S_+ = |e\rangle\langle g|$ and $S_- = (S_+)^\dagger$ satisfying the standard commutators $[S_+, S_-] = 2S_z$, $[S_z, S_\pm] = \pm S_\pm$ of algebra su(2). The coupling of the ion with a light field traveling in the x direction is described by

$$H_{\rm int} \,=\, \lambda \left[E_L \, e^{i(k_L \hat{x} - \omega_L t)} \, S_+ + {\rm H.c.} \right] \,,$$

where λ is the (real) coupling coefficient, $\hat{x}$ is the ion center-of-mass position operator, E_L is the light (laser) amplitude, and the standard formulas $k_L = \omega_L/c = 2\pi/\lambda_L$ hold. By resorting to the canonical picture in terms of displacement and momentum operators

$$\hat{x} = \sqrt{\hbar/(2M\nu)}(a^\dagger + a) \,, \;\; \hat{p} = i\sqrt{\hbar M\nu/2}\,(a^\dagger - a),$$

the interaction Hamiltonian $H_{\rm int}$ can be expressed in an equivalent form depending on the LD parameter η with $k_L\hat{x} = \eta(a^\dagger + a)$ and

$$\eta = k_L \frac{\ell}{\sqrt{2}} \,= \sqrt{2}\,\pi\,\frac{\ell}{\lambda_L} \,. \qquad (1)$$

In formula (1) $\ell = \sqrt{\hbar/(M\nu)}$ represents the characteristic length of the harmonic-confinement region and M is the ion mass. The trapped-ion total Hamiltonian then takes the form (cf., e. g., [10], [11])

$$\begin{aligned} H_t \;&= H_0 + H_{\rm int} \\ &= \; \hbar\nu\hat{n} + \hbar\omega_0 S_z + K\left[e^{-i\omega_L t} e^{i\eta(a^\dagger + a)} S_+ + {\rm H.C.} \right], \end{aligned} \qquad (2)$$

where parameter $K = \lambda E_L$ has been introduced.

A. Transforming the Hamiltonian

The reformulation of Hamiltonian (2) in a form suitable for the application of perturbation theory can be realized in two steps. First, we resort to the unitary time-dependent transformation $U_1 = e^{i\varphi S_z}$, with $\varphi = \varphi(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, so that, by setting consistently $|\Psi(t)\rangle = U_1|\Phi(t)\rangle$, we can recast the Schrödinger problem $i\hbar\partial_t|\Psi(t)\rangle = H_t|\Psi(t)\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (2) into the form

$$i\hbar\,\partial_t|\Phi(t)\rangle \;=\; \left(\hbar\dot{\varphi}S_z \,+\, U_1^\dagger H_t U_1\right)|\Phi(t)\rangle \,.$$

This leads to the new (possibly time-dependent) model Hamiltonian $H_1 = \hbar\dot{\varphi}S_z + U_1^\dagger H_t U_1$. By using the customary transformation formulas

$$e^{i\varphi S_z} S_+ e^{-i\varphi S_z} = e^{i\varphi} S_+ \,, \;\; e^{i\varphi S_z} S_- e^{-i\varphi S_z} = e^{-i\varphi} S_- \,,$$

representing the action of $e^{i\varphi S_z}$ on the algebra-su(2) generators $S_\pm$, and setting $\varphi = -\omega_L t$, we obtain from H_1 the time-independent Hamiltonian

$$H_2 = \hbar\nu\hat{n} - \hbar\Delta\, S_z + K\left[e^{i\eta(a^+ + a)} S_+ + \;{\rm H.c.}\right] \,, \qquad (3)$$

where $\Delta = \omega_L - \omega_0$ is the detuning of the system. It proves now convenient to perform a second unitary transformation $U_2 = e^{i\beta S_z}$ with $\beta = k_L\hat{x}$ which removes the exponential factors depending on $\eta\,(a^\dagger + a) \equiv k_L\hat{x}$ from H_2. Observing that in $U_2^\dagger(\hbar\nu\,\hat{n})U_2$ the term $\hat{p}^2$ undergoes the transformation

$$e^{-i\beta S_z}\hat{p}^2 e^{i\beta S_z} = (\hat{p} + \hbar S_z\partial_x\beta)^2$$

while harmonic term $M\nu^2x^2/2$ is unchanged, we obtain the minimal form for the trapped-ion model

$$\begin{aligned} H_\eta \;&= U_2^\dagger H_2 U_2 \\ &= \; \left(\hbar\nu\hat{n} + \frac{\hbar^2 k_L^2}{8M}\right) + 2KS_x - \hbar\Delta S_z + \frac{\hbar k_L}{M} S_z p \,. \end{aligned} \qquad (4)$$

The comparison with formula (3) (or (2)) clearly shows its considerably simpler form. If the eigenvalue problem $H_\eta|E(n,s)\rangle = E(n,s)|E(n,s)\rangle$ is solved (n and s are suitable quantum numbers relevant to the noninteracting part of H_η), then the general solution to the Schrödinger problem $i\hbar\partial_t|\xi(t)\rangle = H_\eta|\xi(t)\rangle$ is represented by

$$|\xi(t)\rangle = \sum_{(n,s)} C(n,s) e^{-itE(n,s)/\hbar}|E(n,s)\rangle \,, \qquad (5)$$

where $C(n,s)$ are arbitrary amplitudes. In this perspective, the advantage to deal with H_η is evident since, unlike H_t or H_2, H_η features the linear form apt to reconstruct states $|E(n,s)\rangle$ and their eigenvalues within the perturbation theory. In this scenario $\hbar k_L\, S_z\, p/M$ can be interpreted as the perturbation term since $k_L \propto \eta$ assumes arbitrarily small values in the LD regime.

III. PERTURBATIVE SCHEME IN THE LD REGIME

We rewrite Hamiltonian (4) in the form $H_\eta = H_0 + \epsilon W$ where $\epsilon W = (\hbar k_L/M) S_z p$ represents the perturbation term. The natural choice for the perturbation parameter is the dimensionless ratio $\epsilon = \ell/\lambda_L$ which, up to a constant factor, identifies with the LD parameter η. Then potential W is found from

$$W = \frac{\hbar k_L}{\epsilon M}\, S_z p = \, ... \, = i\sqrt{2}\pi\hbar\nu\,(a^\dagger - a) S_z. \qquad (6)$$

Formula (6), controlled by factor $\hbar\nu$, shows that W features the same energy scale of $\hbar\nu\hat{n}$ in the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0. Then the perturbative character of ϵW is ensured by the condition $\epsilon << 1$. In passing, we observe that the k_L^2-dependent term in (4) is not involved in the perturbative scheme since, due to its constant character, it can be embodied in the unperturbed part H_0. According to the stationary perturbation theory [22] we expand both the eigenstates and the relevant eigenvalues in powers of ϵ

$$E(n,s) \;=\; \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^k E_k(n,s)\,, \qquad (7)$$

$$|E(n,s)\rangle \;=\; \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^k |E_k(n,s)\rangle\,, \qquad (8)$$

where $s = \pm$ is associated to the two-level states $|+\rangle \equiv |e\rangle$, $|-\rangle \equiv |g\rangle$ such that $S_z|s\rangle = s|s\rangle/2$. With this notation one also has $S_\pm|\pm\rangle = 0$, and $S_s|-s\rangle = |s\rangle$.

A. The unperturbed problem

In order to solve the unperturbed problem $H_0|E_0(n,s)\rangle = E_0(n,s)|E_0(n,s)\rangle$, we write the eigenstates of H_0 in the form

$$|E_0(n,s)\rangle = |n\rangle T^\dagger |f(s)\rangle\,, \qquad (9)$$

where $|n\rangle$ is the number state such that $\hat{n}|n\rangle = n|n\rangle$, T is a unitary transformation, and $T^\dagger|f(s)\rangle$ is a spinor state defined by

$$T = e^{i\alpha S_y} \quad , \quad |f(s)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ s \end{pmatrix}\,, \qquad (10)$$

the latter satisfying the operator equations

$$S_x|f(s)\rangle = \frac{s}{2}|f(s)\rangle \quad , \quad S_z|f(s)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|f(-s)\rangle\,. \qquad (11)$$

The purely-spin component $2KS_x - \hbar\Delta S_z$ of the unperturbed Hamiltonian

$$H_0 = \left(\hbar\nu\hat{n} + \frac{\hbar^2 k_L^2}{8M}\right) + 2KS_x - \hbar\Delta S_z$$

is readily diagonalized by means of unitary transformation $T^\dagger S_x T = S_x\cos\alpha - S_z\sin\alpha$, showing that

$$\begin{aligned} 2KS_x - \hbar\Delta S_z \;&=\; T^\dagger (CS_x) T \\ &=\; C(S_x\cos\alpha - S_z\sin\alpha)\,, \end{aligned} \qquad (12)$$

with the undetermined angle α fixed by $\mathrm{tg}\alpha = \hbar\Delta/(2K)$. Then

$$C = \sqrt{\hbar^2\Delta^2 + 4K^2}\,,\ \sin\alpha = \frac{\hbar\Delta}{C}\,,\ \cos\alpha = \frac{2K}{C}\,. \qquad (13)$$

The eigenvalues associated to $T^\dagger|f(s)\rangle$ thus coincide with those of the problem $CS_x|f(s)\rangle = \mu_s|f(s)\rangle$. Explicitly,

$$\mu_s = \frac{s}{2}C = \frac{s}{2}\sqrt{\hbar^2\Delta^2 + 4K^2}\,.$$

Hence, the eigenvalues and the eigenstates of the unperturbed problem are given by

$$E_0(n,s) = \frac{\hbar^2 k_L^2}{8M} + \hbar\nu\, n + \frac{s}{2}\sqrt{\hbar^2\Delta^2 + \,4K^2}\,, \qquad (14)$$

$$|E_0(n,s)\rangle = \frac{|n\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\sigma=\pm 1} s^{\frac{1-\sigma}{2}} \Big(\cos\frac{\alpha}{2} - s\sigma\sin\frac{\alpha}{2}\Big)|\sigma\rangle. \qquad (15)$$

B. First-order corrections

In view of the linear dependence of (6) from operators a and $a^\dagger$, one easily shows that the first-order correction to the energy eigenvalues vanishes

$$E_1(n,s) = \langle E_0(n,s)|W|E_0(n,s)\rangle = 0\,.$$

As for the first-order contribution to states $|E(n,s)\rangle$, we have

$$|E_1(n,s)\rangle = \sum_{m\neq n}\sum_{\mu} \frac{\langle E_0(m,\mu)|W|E_0(n,s)\rangle}{E_0(n,s) - E_0(m,\mu)}\,|E_0(m,\mu)\rangle\,,$$

in which, owing to the structure of unperturbed states (9),

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle E_0(m,\mu)|W|E_0(n,s)\rangle \\ &= i\sqrt{2}\pi\hbar\nu\langle m|\big(a^\dagger - a\big)|n\rangle\,\langle f(\mu)|T\,S_z T^\dagger|f(s)\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \qquad (16)$$

Notice that in $|E_1(n,s)\rangle$ the usual specification $\mu \neq s$ in the sum with respect to μ is no longer required: indeed, the no-singularity condition $E_0(m,\mu) \neq E_0(n,s)$ is

certainly verified since $\langle m|(a^\dagger - a)|n\rangle = 0$ if $m = n$, for both $\mu \neq s$ and $\mu = s$. The case $\mu = s$, which should be forbidden whenever $m = n$, can therefore be included in the summations. The quantity (16) can be calculated thanks to the identities

$$\begin{cases} \langle f(s)|T\, S_z T^\dagger|f(s)\rangle = -\frac{s}{2}\sin\alpha \\ \\ \langle f(-s)|T\, S_z T^\dagger|f(s)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\cos\alpha \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

where transformation $TS_zT^\dagger = S_z\cos\alpha - S_x\sin\alpha$ has been used. The final form of $|E_1(n,s)\rangle$ is thus found to be

$$|E_1(n,s)\rangle = \frac{\pi i\hbar\nu}{\sqrt{2}C}\Big\{\frac{s\Delta}{\nu}\Big[\sqrt{n+1}|n+1,s\rangle + \sqrt{n}|n-1,s\rangle\Big]$$

$$+\frac{2K\sqrt{n+1}}{-\hbar\nu + sC}|n+1,-s\rangle - \frac{2K\sqrt{n}}{\hbar\nu + sC}|n-1,-s\rangle\Big\} \tag{18}$$

in which equations (13) have been used for $\sin\alpha$ and $\cos\alpha$, and the simplified notation $|u,s\rangle = |E_0(n+u,s)\rangle$ with $u = -1, 0, +1$ has been introduced.

C. Second-order corrections and resonant case

Within the perturbation scheme based on states (9) the expression of the second-order correction to the energy can be shown to have the form

$$E_2(n,s) = \sum_{m\neq n}\sum_{\mu}\frac{|\langle E_0(m,\mu)|W|E_0(n,s)\rangle|^2}{E_0(n,s) - E_0(m,\mu)}\,.$$

By utilizing equations (16) and (17), we find

$$E_2(n,s) = 2\pi^2(\hbar\nu)^2\left[\sum_{\mu}\frac{(n+1)\,|\langle f(\mu)|T\,S_zT^\dagger|f(s)\rangle|^2}{E_0(n,s) - E_0(n+1,\mu)}\right.$$

$$\left.+\sum_{\mu}\frac{n\,|\langle f(\mu)|T\,S_zT^\dagger|f(s)\rangle|^2}{E_0(n,s) - E_0(n-1,\mu)}\right]$$

$$= \frac{\pi^2(\hbar\nu)^2}{2}\left[-\frac{\sin^2\alpha}{\hbar\nu} + \frac{(2n+1)sC + \hbar\nu}{C^2 - \hbar^2\nu^2}\cos^2\alpha\right], \tag{19}$$

The expression of such second-order contributions remarkably simplifies in the *resonant case*. Equations (14) and (19) show that, in this case,

$$\Delta = 0 \;\;\Rightarrow\;\; \alpha = 0\,,\; C = 2K\,,$$

leading to the second-order expression for the eigenvalues

$$E(n,s) = E_0(n,s) + \epsilon^2 E_2(n,s)$$
$$= \hbar\nu n + sK + \pi^2\hbar\nu\,\epsilon^2\,\frac{K\big[2K + \hbar\nu(2n+1)s\big]}{4K^2 - \hbar^2\nu^2}\,, \tag{20}$$

where one should recall that

$$\epsilon^2 = \frac{\hbar k_L^2}{4\pi^2 M\nu}\,, \qquad K = \lambda\, E_L\,. \tag{21}$$

Note that equations (21) contain the significant physical parameters of the model, namely, the ion mass M, the trap frequency ν, the ion-field coupling constant λ and the laser wavenumber k_L and intensity E_L. In view of equations (15) and (18) (note that for $\alpha = 0$ one has $|E_0(n,s)\rangle = |n\rangle|f(s)\rangle$), the corresponding eigenvector proves to be

$$|E(n,s)\rangle \simeq |E_0(n,s)\rangle + \epsilon|E_1(n,s)\rangle = |n\rangle|f(s)\rangle$$

$$+\,i\epsilon\frac{\pi\hbar\nu}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\frac{\sqrt{n+1}|n+1,-s\rangle}{-\hbar\nu + s2K} - \frac{\sqrt{n}|n-1,-s\rangle}{\hbar\nu + s2K}\right]. \tag{22}$$

For the sake of completeness, the second-order correction $|E_2(n,s)\rangle$ is reported in A.

IV. SPECTRUM STRUCTURE

A significant (totally equivalent) form of eigenvalues (20) is

$$E_*(n,s) = \left[\hbar\nu\left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) + sK\right]\Big(1 + s\gamma\Big) - \frac{\hbar\nu}{2} \tag{23}$$

where the subscript $*$ has been introduced to evidence its factorized form and

$$\gamma = \frac{2\pi^2\hbar\nu\epsilon^2\,K}{4K^2 - \hbar^2\nu^2}\,.$$

A. Spectrum properties

Expression (23) is interesting because it entails an eigenvalue distribution which, owing to γ, is strongly dependent from the interplay of interaction parameters. Various properties can be evinced from eigenvalue (23).

First, it implicitly defines the parameter regions

$$2K < \hbar\nu\,, \quad 2K > \hbar\nu\,,$$

in which γ does not exhibit a diverging behavior, and the value of K and $\hbar\nu$ are compatible with the perturbation approach. In fact, the quantity $1/(2K - \hbar\nu)$ in γ makes it evident how the singularities emerging when K is excessively close to $\hbar\nu/2$ must be avoided. Second, one easily shows that, in the limiting regimes where $2K << \hbar\nu$ or $2K >> \hbar\nu$, $E_*(n,s)$ is characterized by

$$\gamma \simeq -\frac{2K\,\pi^2\epsilon^2}{\hbar\nu}\,, \quad \gamma \simeq \frac{\hbar\nu\,\pi^2\epsilon^2}{2K}\,,$$

satisfying, in both cases, the inequality $|\gamma| << 1$.

Weak-interaction regime. With $2K << \hbar\nu$ one finds

$$E_*(n,s) \simeq -\frac{\hbar\nu}{2} + \hbar\nu\left[\left(n+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(1-\frac{2K\pi^2\epsilon^2 s}{\hbar\nu}\right)+\frac{sK}{\hbar\nu}\right], \quad (24)$$

where the fine structure of $E_*(n,s)$ is determined by sK in which $s=\pm1$ causes, for each n, the occurrence of a *doublet of levels*. In this formula the ϵ-dependent term might be ignored considering that the perturbative factor ϵ^2 in γ is further depressed by $2K/(\hbar\nu) << 1$. This further contribution thereby represents a sort of hyperfine correction to the spectrum.

Strong-interaction regime. The opposite case $2K >> \hbar\nu$ is more complex. One finds

$$E_*(n,s) \simeq K\left[s+\frac{\hbar\nu}{2K}(2n+1)+\pi^2\epsilon^2\frac{\hbar\nu}{2K}\right]-\frac{\hbar\nu}{2}. \quad (25)$$

The spectrum features two bands corresponding to $E_*(n',-1)$ and $E_*(n,+1)$. For $0 \le n' \le 2K/(\hbar\nu)$ eigenvalues $E_*(n',-1)$ are always smaller than $E_*(0,+1)$. For $n' > 2K/(\hbar\nu)$ the levels of the band $s=-1$ intercalate those of the band $s=+1$. In this case, a suitable choice of parameters allows the formation of *interband doublets* such that $E_*(n',-1) \simeq E_*(n,+1)$ provided the condition

$$n' = n + \lfloor 2K/(\hbar\nu) \rfloor,$$

is satisfied when $2K/(\hbar\nu) = m+\delta$ is assumed where m is a positive integer, $\delta << 1$ and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ means integer part of x. Then the separation between the levels of a given doublet is proportional to δ. The fine structure of each band is represented by the n-dependent term in $E_*(n,s)$ while the hyperfine structure is that corresponding to the doublets derived from the superposition of the two bands. The perturbative factor ϵ^2 is, in this case, further depressed by $\hbar\nu/(2K) << 1$.

Intermediate regime $\hbar\nu/(2K) \approx 1$. A third, significant situation is found when K approaches the value $\hbar\nu/2$ but remains far enough from it to preserve the perturbative character of γ. In this case γ can assume both positive and negative values implying that, in $E_*(n,s)$, the factor $(1+s\gamma)$ can decrease ($s\gamma<0$) or increase ($s\gamma>0$) the level separation. Quantum number s plays a central role in determining the change of the spectrum structure.

In particular, for $K \to (\hbar\nu/2)^-$ and $s=-1$ one finds

$$s\gamma \simeq \frac{2\pi^2 K^2\epsilon^2(-1)}{4K(2K-\hbar\nu)} = +\frac{\pi^2\epsilon^2 K}{2|2K-\hbar\nu|} > 0,$$

where $|2K-\hbar\nu|$ can contrast the effect of second-order term ϵ^2 in γ (note that $|2K-\hbar\nu|$ represents a quantity independent from perturbation parameter ϵ since it is fully unrelated to ℓ and λ_L). As a consequence, the separation between subsequent levels $E_*(n,-1)$ and $E_*(n+1,-1)$ tends to grow in that factor $(1+s\gamma)$, which controls this separation, increases.

Instead, for $K \to (\hbar\nu/2)^-$ with $s=+1$, one finds that

$$s\gamma \simeq \frac{2\pi^2 K\epsilon^2\, s\times 2K}{4K(2K-\hbar\nu)} = -\frac{\pi^2\epsilon^2 K}{|2K-\hbar\nu|} < 0.$$

Again factor ϵ^2 (depending on ℓ and λ_L) can be contrasted by a sufficiently small $|2K-\hbar\nu|$. Owing to the reduction of factor $(1+s\gamma)$ ($\gamma<0$) the series of eigenvalues $E_*(n,-1)$ shows a thicker level distribution. The same effects are observed in the case $K \to (\hbar\nu/2)^+$ which displays the decreasing (increasing) of the level separation for $s=-1$ ($s=+1$). Concluding, a peculiar behavior seems to characterize the regime $K \approx \hbar\nu/2$ suggesting that the region around $K=\hbar\nu/2$ (excluded from the perturbative scheme) is the source of a macroscopic changes of the spectrum structure. Crossing this region evidences how, for a given quantum number s, a rarefied level distribution evolves into a thicker one while a thick distribution evolves into a more rarefied one, depending on the direction of the crossing.

B. Time-dependent solutions of the Schrödinger problem relevant to H_t

The general solution to the original Schrödinger problem $i\hbar\partial_t|\Psi(t)\rangle = H_t|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is easily found to be

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi(t)\rangle &= U_1(t)U_2|\xi(t)\rangle \\ &= \sum_{(n,s)} C(n,s)e^{-itE(n,s)/\hbar}|\psi_t(n,s)\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $|\psi_t(n,s)\rangle \equiv U_1(t)U_2|E(n,s)\rangle$ and $|\xi(t)\rangle$ is defined by equation (5). $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is the superposition of elementary time-dependent solutions $|\Psi_t(n,s)\rangle = e^{-itE(n,s)/\hbar}|\psi_t(n,s)\rangle$, that satisfy the same Schrödinger problem. In the present context, $|\Psi_t(n,s)\rangle$ is the counterpart of the *stationary states* characterizing Schrödinger problems in which the Hamiltonian is time independent. Since they are in a one-to-one correspondence with states $|E(n,s)\rangle$ they form a time-dependent basis.

The explicit form of $U_1(t)U_2|E(n,s)\rangle$ is found by determining the action of such transformations. Since $U_2 = \exp[i\eta(a^\dagger+a)S_z]$ one finds, to the first order in the perturbation parameter, that state (22) (with $|n,s\rangle = |n\rangle|f(s)\rangle$ and $a|n\rangle = \sqrt{n}|n-1\rangle$, $a^\dagger|n\rangle = \sqrt{n+1}|n+1\rangle$) becomes

$$U_2|E(n,s)\rangle = |n,s\rangle + \frac{2\pi i K s\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\frac{a^\dagger|n,-s\rangle}{2Ks-\hbar\nu} - \frac{a|n,-s\rangle}{\hbar\nu+2Ks}\right].$$

The action of $U_1(t) = \exp(-i\omega_L t S_z)$ involves only spinor states $|f(s)\rangle$ giving

$$U_1(t)|f(s)\rangle = |f(s)\rangle\cos(\omega_L t/2) - i|f(-s)\rangle\sin(\omega_L t/2).$$

An interesting aspect that deserves some comment is the considerable influence of the spectrum structure, discussed in subsection IV A, on the general solution. In the

regime $2K << \hbar\nu$ state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ will have the form

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum\nolimits_n \Big[C(n,+1)e^{itK/\hbar}|\psi(n,+1)\rangle$$

$$+C(n,-1)e^{-itK/\hbar}|\psi(n,-1)\rangle\Big]e^{-in\nu t}\,,$$

showing how states $|\psi(n,\pm1)\rangle$ of *level doublets* feature a slow internal dynamics in which frequencies $\pm K/\hbar$ could include corrections depending on ϵ^2 (see equation (24)). A different decomposition characterizes the regime $2K >> \hbar\nu$. We find

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = |\Psi_S(t)\rangle + \sum\nolimits_{n=m}^{\infty}\Big[C(n,+1)|\psi(n,+1)\rangle$$

$$+\,C(n+m,-1)e^{it\nu\delta}|\psi(n+m,-1)\rangle\Big]e^{-it[\nu(n+1/2)+K/\hbar]}\,,$$

where $m = \lfloor 2K/(\hbar\nu)\rfloor$, showing again the presence of doublet states $|\psi(n,\pm1)\rangle$ the (slow) internal dynamics of which is controlled by parameter δ (see the comment below equation (25)). State

$$|\Psi_S(t)\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} C(n,-1)e^{-itE(n,-1)/\hbar}|\psi(n,-1)\rangle\,,$$

involves singlet states of the low region of the spectrum exhibiting a fast evolving dynamics.

Concerning the two intermediate regimes where $2K \simeq \hbar\nu$ (notice that $K \to \hbar\nu/2$, i. e., K arbitrarily close to $\hbar\nu/2$ is forbidden) the general solution will be composed by two macroscopic components $|\Psi_\pm(t)\rangle$ relevant to spin states $s = \pm1$ such that $|\Psi(t)\rangle = |\Psi_-(t)\rangle + |\Psi_+(t)\rangle$. According to our discussion on the spectrum structure, if the eigenvalue distribution for $s = \pm1$ is thick then the one for $s = \mp1$ will be rarefied. Suppose that such an effect is emphasized when K approaches $\hbar\nu/2$ from below. If the dominating components of (26) involve eigenvalues $E(n,s)$ ranging in a finite interval of "energies" around a given average energy, a natural situation when a state is prepared experimentally, then $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ will exhibit an almost continuous part corresponding to $|\Psi_+(t)\rangle$ superimposed to $|\Psi_-(t)\rangle$ formed by a few states $|\Psi_t(n,-1)\rangle$. Due to this very unbalanced situation we conjecture that composition of $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ could be dramatically changed by a relatively small change of K. This will depend on the actual size of the region around $K = \hbar\nu/2$ that separates the opposite situations where K is approaching $\hbar\nu/2$ from below and from above. In the latter case $|\Psi_-(t)\rangle$ is almost continuous while $|\Psi_+(t)\rangle$ involves a few states $|\Psi_t(n,+1)\rangle$. The possibly macroscopic character of this effect could be proven through an exact reconstruction of the spectrum around $K = \hbar\nu/2$ *via* numerical calculations.

V. THE JAYNES-CUMMINGS PICTURE OF H_η

In this section we show that the Jaynes-Cummings (JC) model naturally emerges from Hamiltonian H_η in the parameter-space region where the Rotating Wave Approximation (RWA) is viable. This region exactly corresponds to the intermediate regime $K \simeq \hbar\nu/2$ (and the case $K = \hbar\nu/2$ is admitted) where the perturbation theory cannot be implemented. This circumstance seems to be a distinctive feature of the model described by Hamiltonian (4)

$$H_\eta^{\rm r} = \hbar\nu\hat{n} + \frac{\hbar^2k_L^2}{8M} + 2KS_x + \frac{\hbar k_L}{M}\,S_z\,p\,,$$

in which the resonance condition $\Delta = 0$ has been assumed. $H_\eta^{\rm r}$ can be expressed in an equivalent form by introducing the (nonstandard) raising and lowering operators

$$D_+ = S_y + iS_z\,,\;\; D_- = S_y - iS_z\,.$$

If $S_x = D_z$ is assumed, then D_z, D_- and D_+ are shown to satisfy commutators

$$[D_z, D_\pm] = \pm D_\pm\,,\;\; [D_+, D_-] = 2D_z\,,$$

thereby providing an alternative (but equivalent) basis of generators for the algebra su(2). The link with the standard basis S_z and $S_\pm$ is realized by the unitary transformation $U^\dagger S_\sigma U = D_\sigma$, $\sigma = z, \pm$, discussed in B. In this picture one has

$$H_\eta^{\rm r} = \hbar\nu\hat{n} + \frac{\hbar^2k_L^2}{8M} + 2KD_z + \frac{\hbar k_L}{M}\,D_y\,p\,, \qquad (27)$$

with $D_y = (D_+ - D_-)/(2i) = S_z$ and $D_x = (D_+ + D_-)/2 = S_y$. With respect to Hamiltonian H_η, the application of the RWA implies the condition

$$2K \simeq \hbar\nu\,,$$

K and $\hbar\nu$ being the characteristic energies of the non interacting part of $H_\eta^{\rm r}$. In fact, it is well known, that transforming Hamiltonian (27) in the interaction picture, the action of operators D_-a and $D_+a^\dagger$ is negligible since they are multiplied by fast oscillating factors $\exp[\pm it(\nu + 2K/\hbar)]$ while $D_-a^\dagger$ and D_+a survive because, due to $K \simeq \hbar\nu/2$, the relevant oscillating factors $\exp[\pm it(\nu - 2K/\hbar)]$ are essentially time independent. Then, in

$$D_y\,p = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar M\nu}{2}}\Big(D_+a^\dagger - D_+a - D_-a^\dagger + D_-a\Big)\,,$$

the virtual processes corresponding to terms D_-a and $D_+a^\dagger$ are negligible, so that the final form of $H_\eta^{\rm r}$ is

$$H_{JC} = \hbar\nu\hat{n} + \frac{\hbar^2k_L^2}{8M} + 2KD_z + \Gamma\left(D_-a^\dagger + D_+a\right)\,, \qquad (28)$$

with $\Gamma = -\pi\hbar\nu\epsilon/\sqrt{2}$. Model (28) represents the JC form of the original Hamiltonian $H_\eta^{\rm r}$. In this form the latter is block-diagonal: specifically, with respect to the states

$|n-1\rangle \otimes U^\dagger|e\rangle$, $|n\rangle \otimes U^\dagger|g\rangle$, the n-th 2×2 block, $n \geq 1$, is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hbar\nu(n-1)+K & \Gamma\sqrt{n} \\ \Gamma\sqrt{n} & \hbar\nu n - K \end{bmatrix} .$$

The latter reduces to $-K$ in the degenerate case $n = 0$. The nice algebraic properties of model (28) from which the block-diagonal structure is stemmed are reviewed in C. The diagonalization of H_{JC} is straightforward, the eigenvalues being

$$E_{JC}(n,\pm) = \hbar\nu\left(n-\frac{1}{2}\right) \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\hbar\nu-2K)^2}{4}+\Gamma^2 n} ,$$

where only the lower sign applies for $n = 0$. Such an expression appears to be very different from eigenvalues (23). When $\hbar\nu = 2K$, eigenvalues $E_{JC}(n,s)$ exhibit a linear dependence on $\Gamma \propto \epsilon$ which might be interpreted as the signature of the transition from the $\hbar\nu - 2K > 0$ to the $\hbar\nu - 2K < 0$ regime.

The complementary character of the JC regime, where $\hbar\nu \simeq 2K$, with respect to regimes where $\hbar\nu > 2K$ or $\hbar\nu < 2K$ is confirmed when reformulating perturbed eigenstates $|E(n,s)\rangle$ in terms of operators a, $a^\dagger$ and $D_\pm$. In D we show that, in addition to $D_- a^\dagger$ and $D_+ a$, the correction $|E_1(n,s)\rangle$ is generated by the action of $D_- a$ and $D_+ a^\dagger$ on $|E_0(n,s)\rangle$, namely, by the operators excluded from the JC picture.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have studied the time-dependent model describing the ion-light interaction within a typical scheme which reduces the latter to a (unitarily equivalent) time-independent minimal form. The resulting Hamiltonian H_η features a simple operator structure and a linear dependence on the LD parameter η that have allowed us to diagonalize H_η *via* the standard perturbation method.

In section III we have determined the second-order analytic expressions of the eigenstates and the eigenvalues in terms of the physically significant parameters of the model (see equation (21)). The eigenvalue formula has been used in section IV to identify four independent regimes that correspond to different spectrum structures in which the eigenvalue distribution can be more or less dense and possibly includes level doublets. In particular, we have shown that the level density exhibits contrasting behaviors in the *intermediate* regimes characterized by K "close" to $\hbar\nu/2$: for $s = -1$, it is decreasing when approaching K_0 from below and increasing when approaching $\hbar\nu/2$ from above. The opposite effect characterizes the choice $s = +1$. We thus expect to observe considerable changes of the spectrum in the unexplored neighbourhood of $\hbar\nu/2$ where the perturbation scheme cannot be applied. In passing, we note that similar effects have been observed in simple few-mode bosonic models [24]. In this case the decreasing of the level separation has been related to the transition from stable to unstable regimes.

In the second part of section IV we have reconstructed the general solution of the Schrödinger problem of model H_t by superposing the elementary solutions of minimal model H_η. The information about the eigenvalue distribution has been used to investigate the structure of the general solution in the four regimes characterizing the eigenvalue spectrum. To complete our exploration of Hamiltonian H_η, in section V we have applied the RWA to H_η reducing the latter to a Jaynes-Cummings model. Since this approximation is based on the condition $K \simeq \hbar\nu/2$, then the RWA leads, quite naturally, to obtain information about the intermediate (unexplored) regime where the perturbation scheme cannot be applied. In particular, we have found that the modifications of the algebraic structure of $H_\eta^{\rm r}$ caused by the RWA strongly influence the spectrum of H_{JC} changing the ϵ^2-dependence into the simpler dependence on ϵ for $K = \hbar\nu/2$.

Future work will be focused on investigating the spectrum changes caused by the crossing of the RWA intermediate regime. The spectral properties of the non-resonant case $\Delta \neq 0$ will be also explored. This requires a more extended analysis supported by numerical calculations to get an exact description of the observed effects. The decreasing of the level separation in certain regimes also suggests the application of the continuous-variable picture in the RWA intermediate regime. This picture has been successfully applied [25, 26] to attractive bosonic lattices, characterized by a dense level distribution, to study the transition between different dynamical regimes.

Acknowledgments

The financial support of the Italian government through the M.I.U.R. project "Collective quantum phenomena: From strongly correlated systems to quantum simulators" (PRIN 2010LLKJBX) is gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix A: Eigenstate second-order corrections

The second-order corrections in $|E(n,s)\rangle \simeq |E_0(n,s)\rangle + \epsilon|E_1(n,s)\rangle + \epsilon^2|E_2(n,s)\rangle$ can be easily calculated by means of the standard formula

$$|E_2(n,s)\rangle = \sum_{m\neq n}\sum_r \frac{\langle|E_0(m,r)|W|E_1(n,s)\rangle}{E_0(n,s)-E_0(m,r)}|E_0(m,r)\rangle.$$

From

$$W\ \ |E_1(n,s)\rangle = \sqrt{2}i\pi\hbar\nu(a^\dagger - a)S_z$$

$$\times\ \ i\epsilon\frac{\pi\hbar\nu}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\frac{\sqrt{n+1}|n+1,-s\rangle}{-\hbar\nu+s2K} - \frac{\sqrt{n}|n-1,-s\rangle}{\hbar\nu+s2K}\right]$$

$$= -\pi^2\hbar^2\nu^2\Big[\frac{\sqrt{n+1}\sqrt{n+2}|n+2,s\rangle}{2(2sK-\hbar\nu)} - \frac{\sqrt{n}\sqrt{n-1}|n-2,s\rangle}{2(2sK+\hbar\nu)} + (...)|n,s\rangle\Big] ,$$

where the contribution of states $|n,s\rangle$ in $W|E_1(n,s)\rangle$ can be neglected due to the condition $m \neq n$, one finds

$$|E_2(n,s)\rangle = \pi^2\hbar\nu\Big[\frac{a^2|n,s\rangle}{2(2sK+\hbar\nu)} - \frac{(a^\dagger)^2|n,s\rangle}{2(2sK-\hbar\nu)}\Big] .$$

Appendix B: New basis of su(2)

The unitary transformation $U^\dagger S_\sigma U = D_\sigma$ connects S_z and $S_\pm$ with D_z and $D_\pm$, respectively. Its explicit definition is given by $U = \exp(i\alpha S_y)\exp(i\phi S_x)$ where $\alpha = \phi = \pi/2$. For example, with $S_- = S_x - iS_y$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} U^\dagger S_- U &= e^{-i\phi S_x}e^{-i\alpha S_y}(S_x - iS_y)S_z e^{i\alpha S_y}e^{i\phi S_x} \\ &= e^{-i\phi S_x}(S_x\cos\alpha - S_z\sin\alpha - iS_y)e^{i\phi S_x} . \end{aligned}$$

so that $U^\dagger S_- U = -e^{-i\phi S_x}(S_z + iS_y)e^{i\phi S_x}$ for $\alpha = \pi/2$. Then the action of the ϕ-dependent transformation gives

$$\begin{aligned} U^\dagger S_- U &= -e^{-i\phi S_x}(S_z + iS_y)e^{i\phi S_x} \\ &= -\Big[S_z\cos\phi - S_y\sin\phi + i(S_y\cos\phi + S_z\sin\phi)\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

with $U^\dagger S_- U = S_y - iS_z = D_-$ for $\phi = \pi/2$.

Appendix C: Diagonalization scheme of the JC model

Hamiltonian (28) features a dynamical algebra again showing the structure of algebra su(2). Indeed, since

$$[D_+a, D_-a^\dagger] = 2D_zN , \;\; [D_+a, N] = [D_-a^\dagger, N] = 0 ,$$

where $N \doteq (\hat{n} + D_z + 1/2)$ denotes (the quantum version of) a constant of the motion relevant to Hamiltonian (28), one readily proves that the new operators

$$J_z = D_z , \;\; J_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}D_+a , \;\; J_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}D_-a^\dagger ,$$

satisfy $[J_+, J_-] = 2J_z$ and $[J_z, J_\pm] = \pm J_\pm$. The latter can be seen as the generators of a more general algebra su(2) representing the dynamical algebra of the JC model. In fact, up to constant term, Hamiltonian (28) can be expressed as a linear combination of J_z and $J_\pm$

$$H_{JC} = \hbar\nu(N - 1/2) + (2K - \hbar\nu)J_z + \Gamma\sqrt{N}(J_+ + J_-) .$$

The algebra su(2) generated by J_z and $J_\pm$ turns out to be a special case of the su(2) representation for generalised JC models reported in [23].

Appendix D: Operators generating the first order-correction $|E_1(n,s)\rangle$

Eigenstates (22), including the first-order correction, can be written as

$$|E(n,s)\rangle = |n\rangle|f(s)\rangle - \frac{i\pi\hbar\nu\epsilon|R(n,s)\rangle}{\sqrt{2}(\hbar^2\nu^2 - 4K^2)} ,$$

with

$$|R(n,s)\rangle = (\hbar\nu + s2K)a^\dagger|n,-s\rangle + (\hbar\nu - s2K)a|n,-s\rangle .$$

Owing to the identities (11), $S_x|f(s)\rangle = (s/2)|f(s)\rangle$ and $S_z|f(s)\rangle = (1/2)|f(-s)\rangle$, state $|R(n,s)\rangle$ reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} |R(n,s)\rangle &= 2\hbar\nu(a^\dagger + a)S_z|n,s\rangle + 4sK(a^\dagger - a)S_z|n,s\rangle \\ &= 2\hbar\nu(a^\dagger + a)S_z|n,s\rangle + 8K(a^\dagger - a)S_zS_x|n,s\rangle \\ &= 2\hbar\nu(a^\dagger + a)S_z|n,s\rangle + 4Ki(a^\dagger - a)S_y|n,s\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

Then $|R(n,s)\rangle$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} |R(n,s)\rangle &= -i\Big((\hbar\nu - 2K)(D_+a^\dagger + D_-a)\Big)|n,s\rangle \\ &\quad -i\Big((\hbar\nu + 2K)(D_+a - D_-a^\dagger)\Big)|n,s\rangle , \end{aligned}$$

showing that, in addition to operators D_+a and $D_-a^\dagger$ characterizing the JC Hamiltonian, the first-order corrections of state $|E(n,s)\rangle$ must include operators D_-a and $D_+a^\dagger$ occurring in model H_η through the interaction term D_yp (see equation (27)).

[1] Häffner H, Roos C F, Blatt R 2008 *Phys. Rep.* **469** 155
[2] Ivanov S S, Vitanov N V, and Korolkova N V 2013 *New J. Phys.* **15** 023039
[3] Schmidt-Kaler F, Gulde S, Riebe M, Deuschle T, Kreuter A, Lancaster G, Becher C, Eschner J, Häffner H, and Blatt R 2003 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **36** 623
[4] Ivanov P A, Ivanov S S, Vitanov N V, Mering A, Fleischhauer M, and Singer K 2009 *Phys. Rev. A* **80** 060301(R)
[5] Bermudez A, Martin-Delgado M A, and Porras D 2010 *New J. Phys.* **12** 123016
[6] Porras D and Cirac J I 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** 207901
[7] Johanning M, Varon A F and Wunderlich C 2009 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **42** 154009
[8] Wineland D J, Monroe C, Itano W M, Leibfried D, King B E, and Meekhof D 1998 *J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol.* **103** 259
[9] Leibfried D, Blatt R, Monroe C, and Wineland D 2003

Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** 281
[10] Moya-Cessa H, Soto-Eguibar F, Vargas-Martínez J M, Juárez-Amaro R, and Zúñiga-Segundo A 2012 *Phys. Rep.* **513** 229
[11] Blockley C A and Walls D F 1993 *Phys. Rev. A* **47** 2115
[12] Vogel W and de Matos Filho R L 1995 *Phys. Rev. A* **52** 4214
[13] Wei L F, Liu S Y, and Lei X L 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 062316
[14] Zheng X-J, Fang M-F, Liao X-P, and Cai J-W 2007 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **40** 507
[15] Cirac J I, Blatt R, Parkins A S, and Zoller P 1994 *Phys. Rev. A* **49** 1202
[16] Onofrio R, Viola L 1997 *Phys. Rev. A* **55** 3291
[17] Wang D, Hansson T, Larson Å, Karlsson H O, and Larson J 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* **77** 053808
[18] Moya-Cessa H, Vidiella-Barranco A, Roversi J A, Freitas D S, and Dutra S M 1999 *Phys. Rev. A* **59** 2518
[19] Porras D, Marquardt F, von Delft J, and Cirac J I 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* **78** 010101
[20] Larson J 2007 *Phys. Scripta* **76** 146
[21] Braak D, 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** 100401
[22] Cohen-Tannoudji C, Dui B, and Laloe F, *Quantum Mechanics*, vol. II (Hermann, Paris, 1977).
[23] Yu S, Rauch H, and Zhang Y 1995 *Phys. Rev. A* **52** 2585
[24] Penna V 2013 *Phys. Rev. E* **87** 052909
[25] Zin P, Chwedenczuk J, Ole B, Sacha K, and Trippenbach M 2008 *Europhys. Lett.* **83** 64007
[26] Buonsante P, Penna V, and Vezzani A 2011 *Phys. Rev. A* **84** 061601